IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| GARY PAVLIC, |) | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| |) | Civil Action No. 11-672 |
| Petitioner, |) | Judge Terrence F. McVerry |
| |) | Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan |
| v. |) | |
| DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF |) | ECF No. 19 |
| WASHINGTON COUNTY, |) | |
| PENNSYLVANIA and THE |) | |
| ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE |) | |
| STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondents. | | |

ORDER

Pending before the court is a motion for permission to supplement Petitioner's habeas corpus petition. The petition was filed in May, 2011. Although petitioner states that he was deprived access to his legal materials it is still over a year since the original petition was filed. Petitioner further requests that he be provided with a list of all documents in his state court record. Petitioner should already have copies of everything in his state court record. In addition, Petitioner is advised that any copies he requests the court to make must be paid for at a charge of fifty cents per page, despite the fact that he is proceeding *in forma pauperis*.

The *in forma pauperis* statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915, allows for the waiver of prepayment filing fees, but does not provide for the payment of any other litigation expenses. There is no statute this Court is aware of that authorizes the court to commit federal funds to pay for expenses in a civil litigation matter. <u>Tabron v. Grace</u>, 6 F.3d 147, 158-59 (3d Cir. 1993). *See also* <u>Perkins v. Rich</u>, 198 F. Supp 615 (D.C. Del 1961) (holding that 28 U.S.C. § 1915 applied only to court costs and did not authorize the plaintiff to be furnished with copies free of charge);

In re Fullman, 152 F. 2d 141 (App. D.C. 1945)(finding that there is no provision in 28 U.S.C. §

1915 requiring the district court or the clerk thereof to furnish the indigent litigant with copies of

papers or records.)

There is no index of the state court records provided and it is not the court's obligation to

review the records to compile a list of the documents and transcripts included. In addition,

Petitioner needs to be more specific as to what it is he is seeking and what he would like to add

as a supplement. If he can do so, the court will reconsider his request to supplement his petition.

Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED this 8th day of November, 2012, that Petitioner's Motion

for Permission to Supplement is **DENIED** without prejudice to refile as indicated above.

Lisa Pupo Lenihan

United States Magistrate Judge

Cc: GARY PAVLIC

DV 2415

SCI Smithfield

1120 Pike Street

Huntingdon, PA 16652